Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID S QUAIR,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff,

v.

GAVIN NEWSOM, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-08421-JD

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The original complaint was dismissed with leave to amend and plaintiff has filed an amended complaint.

DISCUSSION

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the Court must identify any cognizable claims, and dismiss any claims which are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. Id. at 1915A(b)(1),(2). Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed. Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Although a complaint "does not need detailed factual allegations, . . . a plaintiff's obligation to provide the 'grounds' of his 'entitle[ment] to relief' requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do. . . . Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citations omitted). A complaint must proffer "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its

face." *Id.* at 570. The United States Supreme Court has explained the "plausible on its face" standard of *Twombly*: "While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations. When there are well-pleaded factual allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: (1) a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) the alleged deprivation was

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: (1) a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

LEGAL CLAIMS

In the original complaint, plaintiff sought to make out a variety of claims concerning the conditions of his incarceration. The Court noted that all of plaintiff's claims lacked any factual allegations to support them, and so were not plausible claims. Plaintiff was provided an opportunity to amend to state with facts how specific defendants violated his constitutional rights.

The amended complaint did not do that. Plaintiff again alleges in a conclusory fashion that his conviction and conditions of confinement have resulted in the disregard for his life, liberty, health and safety. Plaintiff provides no facts or details, and fails to identify the actions of any specific defendant.

These barebones allegations are not enough to proceed with this case. Because plaintiff has already been provided leave to amend and failed to address the shortcomings spelled out by the Court, further leave to amend is not warranted. The complaint is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to state a claim.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 9, 2020

JAMES DONATO United States District Judge

Northern District of California United States District Court

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 2 3 DAVID S QUAIR, 4 Case No. <u>19-cv-08421-JD</u> Plaintiff, 5 v. **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 6 GAVIN NEWSOM, et al., 7 Defendants. 8 9 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. 10 District Court, Northern District of California. 11 12 That on March 9, 2020, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing 13 said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by 14 depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery 15 receptacle located in the Clerk's office. 16 David S Quair ID: BG0478 17 North Kern State Prison 18 Facility D P.O. Box 5005 19 Delano, CA 93216-0567 20 21 Dated: March 9, 2020 22 23 24 25 26

Susan Y. Soong Clerk, United States District Court

LISA R. CLARK, Deputy Clerk to the Honorable JAMES DONATO